

and wherein the conference server is capable of transmitting said shared portion of said data set to two or more clients in parallel.

2. (Thrice Amended) A conferencing system comprising:

at least one client;

a conference server;

network connections between the conference server and the at least one client, wherein the at least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a data set, wherein the conference server updates said version of said shared portion of said data set after taking into consideration the network connection speeds and loads and client computing speeds and loads, and wherein the conference server is capable of transmitting said shared portion of said data set to two or more clients in parallel.

24. (Amended) A conferencing system according to claim 23, wherein the data updates are delivered to each client by the conference server after the conference server evaluates the network connection speeds and loads and client computing speeds and loads.

27. (Amended) A conferencing system according to claim 23, further comprising:
a plurality of transcoder for transforming the data updates between a first format and a second format.

29. (Amended) A conferencing system according to claim 27, wherein a first transcoder is associated with the at least one client, a second transcoder is associated with the presenter, and a third transcoder is associated with the conference server; and wherein which one of the first, second and third transcoder is activated depends on the network connection speeds and loads, client computing speeds and loads, conference server computing speeds and loads and presenter computing speeds and loads.

30. (Amended) A conferencing system according to claim 23, further comprising:
a plurality of compression mechanisms for compressing the data updates;
wherein a first compression mechanism is associated with the conference server, and a second compression mechanism is associated with the presenter; and

wherein which one of the first and second compression mechanisms is activated depends on the network connection speeds and loads, client computing speeds and loads, conference server computing speeds and loads and presenter computing speeds and loads.

31. (Amended) A conferencing system according to claim 30, further comprising: a plurality of decompression mechanisms for decompressing compressed data updates;

wherein a first decompression mechanism is associated with the conference server, and a second decompression mechanism is associated with the at least one client; and

wherein which one of the first and second decompression mechanisms is activated depends on the network connection speeds and loads, client computing speeds and loads, and conference server computing speeds and loads, and presenter computing speeds and loads.

Please add the following claim:

--38. (New) A conferencing system according to claim 23, wherein the data updates are forwarded from the presenter to the conference server after the presenter evaluates the presenter computing speeds and loads, the network connection speeds and loads, and conference server computing speeds and loads.--

REMARKS

It is acknowledged that claim 33 is directed to Group II as identified in the August 23, 2000 Office Action. Claim 33 is hereby canceled and withdrawn from consideration without any prejudice.

Upon entry of this amendment which adds claim 38, claims 1, 2, 23-32, and 38 remain pending. Claims 1, 2 and 23-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being patentable over Tung et al. ("Tung") (U.S. Pat. No. 5,859,979) in view of Choquier et al. ("Choquier") (U.S. Pat. No. 5,774,668). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the comments below.

With regard to claims 1 and 2, as best understood, it is alleged that Tung discloses all the claimed elements except that the shared portion of the data set or display is updated at a rate dependent on the network connection speeds and that the update is done based on client computing speeds and loads. However, it is argued that it would have been obvious to one of